

BERNARD MARIGNY.

DECEMBER 19, 1831.

Mr. C. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Private Land Claims, made the following

REPORT:

*The committee to whom was referred the petition of Bernard Marigny, report:*

The petitioner prays the confirmation of his title to two tracts of land, situate in the State of Louisiana, and parish of St. Tammany. One of the said tracts, consisting of four thousand and twenty arpents, was surveyed for Antonio Bonnabel, under whom the petitioner claims, on the 15th January, 1799, by Carlos Trudeau, the royal surveyor of the province of Louisiana, and a patent for the same was issued by Governor Gayoso, on the 25th January, 1799.

The other tract claimed, consisting of seven hundred and seventy-four arpents, is contiguous to the one before mentioned. It was granted on the 20th January, 1777, by Peter Chester, British Governor at Pensacola, to one Lewis Davis, whose title to the same was afterwards, to wit, on the 11th June, 1788, confirmed by decree of Estevan Miro, Spanish Governor of the provinces of Florida and Louisiana.

Habitation and cultivation is shown from in and about the period of the grant, up to the present time.

It appears that claims for both these tracts were filed, one in the name of Bonnabel, the other in the name of the heirs of Lewis Davis, with James O. Cosby, the land commissioner at St. Helena court house, under the act of 1812. In the report of the said commissioner, in 1816, which was adopted by the law of Congress of 3d March, 1819, the said claim of Bonnabel was recommended for confirmation; but, in the opinion of the committee, a clerical error was therein committed, by carrying out the quantity in figures, as 400 arpents, instead of 4,020, as specified in the grant.

On the other claim of seven hundred and seventy-four arpents, which had been presented in the name of the heirs of Lewis Davis, no report was made by the commissioner; an omission, the committee think, which must have been accidental, seeing that no reason is assigned for it; and that, in their opinion, the title was fully established.

Deeming both the claims valid, for the respective quantities called for, the committee report a bill to that end.

BERNARD MARIGNY

December 19, 1831

REPORT

Mr. C. Johnson, from the Committee on Private Land Claims, made the following

The committee to whom was referred the petition of Bernard Marigny, report

The petitioner states the commission of his title in two parts of land situated in the State of Louisiana, and north of St. Tammany. One of the said parts, consisting of four thousand and twenty arpents, was surveyed for Bernard Marigny, under whose name the petition claims on the 18th June 1783, by Carlos Trudeau, the royal surveyor of the province of Louisiana, and a patent for the same was issued by Governor O'Reilly, on the 23d January, 1783.

The other part claimed, consisting of seven hundred and seventy-four arpents, is contained in the one before mentioned. It was granted on the 20th January, 1783, by Carlos Trudeau, French Governor of Louisiana, to one Lewis Davis, who, like the first, was afterwards granted, on the 11th June, 1783, confirmed by decree of Governor Alton, Spanish Governor of the province of Louisiana.

Settlement and cultivation is shown from and about the period of the grant up to the present time.

It appears that claims for both these tracts were filed, one in the name of Bernard, the other in the name of the heirs of Lewis Davis, with James O. Cosby, the land commissioner of St. Helena court house, under the act of 1812. In the report of the said commissioner in 1816, which was adopted by the law of Congress of 24 March, 1819, the said claim of Bernard was recommended for confirmation; but in the opinion of the committee, a clerical error was therein committed by carrying out the quantity in figures as 400 arpents, instead of 4,000, as specified in the grant.

The other claim of seven hundred and seventy-four arpents, which had been presented in the name of the heirs of Lewis Davis, no report was made by the commissioner; an omission, the committee think, which must have been accidentally so, that no reason is assigned for it; and that, in their opinion, the title was fully established.

According to the minutes read, for the respective quantities called for, the committee report a bill to that end.